

### REMARKS

Applicant has carefully reviewed and considered the Office Action mailed on April 6, 2007 and the references cited therewith.

Claims 1, 3-7, 12, 13, 16, 17, 19, 25 and 27 have been amended. Claims 29 and 30 have been newly canceled without prejudice or disclaimer. As result, claims 1-28 remain pending in the application.

#### § 112 Rejection of Claims 1, 19 and 29

On pages 2-4 of the Office Action, claims 1, 19 and 29 were rejected under 35 USC § 112, second paragraph, as allegedly being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which Applicant regards as the invention. Applicant amended claims 1, 19 and 29 and submits that the amended claims obviate the rejection.

With respect to claim 1, pages 2 and 3 of the Office Action state that the phrase “concentrate” is unclear, that the phrase “notification of an event of the event source corresponding to the base event” is unclear, that the phrase “an event instance corresponding to the base event from the event source” is unclear, and that the phrase “to which of the one or more event requests the event instance corresponds” is unclear.

Applicant replaced the phrase “concentrate” with the phrase “combine”, replaced the phrase “notification of an event of the event source corresponding to the base event” with “notification of an event instance, the event instance corresponding to a base event”, replaced the phrase “an event instance corresponding to the base event from the event source” with “the notification of the event instance”, and replaced the phrase “to which of the one or more event requests the event instance corresponds” with “to which of one or more of the first event request and the second event request the event instance corresponds”. Applicant submits that claim 1 is now definite and respectfully requests that the rejection of claim 1 be withdrawn.

With respect to claim 19, page 3 of the Office Action states that the phrase “thereto” is unclear, that the phrases “in association” and “associated” are unclear, that the phrase “an event instance corresponding to the base event from the event source” is unclear, that the phrase “concentrating” is unclear, and that the phrase “to which of the one or more event requests the event instance corresponds” is unclear.

A portion of claim 19, which included the phrase “thereto” recited “the first request including information specific thereto.” Applicant amended this portion of claim 19 to recite “the first event request including information specific to the first event request.” With respect to the phrases “in association” and “associated”, Applicant amended claim 19 to eliminate these phrases. With respect to the phrase “concentrating”, Applicant replaced this phrase with the phrase “combining”. Applicant submits that claim 19 is now definite and respectfully requests that the rejection of claim 19 be withdrawn.

Claim 29 is canceled without prejudice or disclaimer, thereby making the rejection of this claim moot. Applicant, therefore, respectfully requests that the rejection of claim 29 be withdrawn.

§ 103 Rejection of Claims 1-14 and 16-30

On pages 4-6 of the Office Action, claims 1-14 and 16-30 were rejected under 35 USC § 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 6,604,093 to Etzion et al. (Etzion) in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,321,837 to Daniel et al. (Daniel). Applicant respectfully traverses the rejection with respect to claims 1-14 and 16-28. Claims 1, 3-7, 16, 17, 19 and 25 are amended only to more clearly recite the claimed invention. Claim 27 is amended to depend from claim 26, instead of claim 19.

Amended independent claim 1 is directed to a system for notifying clients of job-related event instances. The system includes, among other things, a second trigger engine configured to communicate with a first trigger engine to receive a registration of a single base event request (which combines a first event request and a second event request) at the second trigger engine, and further configured to receive a notification of an event instance, wherein the event instance corresponds to a base event.

On pages 5-6 of the Office Action, the Office Action states that “Etzion fails to disclose a second trigger engine registers multiple event requests that are grouped with similar requests into a base request.” Applicant submits that Etzion further fails to disclose or suggest a second trigger engine configured to communicate with a first trigger engine to receive a registration of a single base event request (which combines a first event request and a second event request) at the

second trigger engine, and further configured to receive a notification of an event instance, wherein the event instance corresponds to a base event, as recited in claim 1.

Daniel relates to an event handling mechanism that categorizes events of a raw event stream into groups of events and associates an action or actions with each group of events (Daniel, at col. 1, lines 7-11). According to Daniel, events of an event stream or streams are filtered into categories or groups of events, and an action or actions are associated with the categorized groups of events (Daniel, col. 2, lines 12-18). Daniel discloses a parsing mechanism, which parses out select elements of each event included in a raw event stream to produce a standardized event, and a filtering mechanism, which applies selection criteria of filter table entries and applies the selection criteria to element types and values of the standardized event (Daniel, col. 2, lines 19-41). If a match is detected, an action mechanism is employed to determine an action to take for a matching group or event entry in an action table.

Applicant submits that Daniel is concerned with receiving multiple events, categorizing the events into groups and performing an action associated with a group to which a received event is categorized. Daniel is completely devoid of any disclosure or suggestion of a second trigger engine configured to communicate with a first trigger engine to receive a registration of a single base event request (which combines a first event request and a second event request) at the second trigger engine, and further configured to receive notification of an event instance, wherein the event instance corresponds to a base event, as required by claim 1.

For at least the above-mentioned reasons, Applicant submits that claim at 1 is patentable over Etzion in view of Daniel and respectfully requests that the rejection of claim 1 be withdrawn.

Claims 2-14 and 16-18 depend from claim 1, either directly or as a base claim. Applicant submits that claims 2-14 and 16-18 are patentable over Etzion in view of Daniel for at least the reasons discussed above, with respect to claim 1. Therefore, Applicant respectfully requests the rejection of claims 2-14 and 16-18 be withdrawn.

Amended independent claim 19 is directed to a method, in a computer network, for notifying clients of events. The method includes, among other things, combining a first event request and a second event request into a single base event request, and registering the single base event request at a remote server.

Applicant submits that the above-mentioned features of claim 19 are similar to the previously-discussed feature of claim 1. Applicant further submits that claim 19 is patentable over Etzion in view of Daniel for reasons similar to those discussed with respect claim 1. Therefore, Applicant respectfully requests that the rejection of claim 19 be withdrawn.

Claims 20-28 depend from claim 19, either directly or as a base claim. Applicant submit that claims 20-28 are patentable over Etzion in view of Daniel for at least the reasons discussed above, with respect to claim 19. Therefore, Applicant respectfully requests the rejection of claims 20-28 be withdrawn.

Claims 29 and 30 are canceled without prejudice or disclaimer, thereby making the rejection of these claims moot. Applicant respectfully requests that the rejection of claims 29 and 30 be withdrawn.

Applicant notes that, with respect to the rejection of claims 19-30, the Office Action refers to the combination of Etzion and Brown. Applicant assumed that the Office Action intended to refer to Etzion and Daniel because these claims were rejected as allegedly being unpatentable over Etzion and Daniel, not over Etzion and Brown.

#### § 103 Rejection of Claim 15

On page 7 of the Office Action, claim 15 was rejected under 35 USC § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Etzion in view of Daniel, and further in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,658,485 to Baber et al. (Baber). Applicant respectfully traverses the rejection.

Claim 15 depends from claim 1, which is patentable over Etzion in view of Daniel for at least the reasons discussed above with respect to claim 1. Applicant submits that Baber fails to satisfy the deficiencies of Etzion and Daniel. Therefore, Applicant respectfully requests that the rejection of claim 15 be withdrawn.

Conclusion

Applicant respectfully submits that the claims are in condition for allowance and notification to that effect is earnestly requested. The Examiner is invited to telephone Applicant's attorney (425-707-9382) to facilitate prosecution of this application.

If necessary, please charge any additional fees or credit overpayment to Deposit Account No. 500463.

Respectfully submitted,

By their Representatives,

Date December 6, 2007

By /Richard C. Irving/  
Richard C. Irving  
Reg. No. 38,499

**CERTIFICATE UNDER 37 CFR 1.8:** The undersigned hereby certifies that this correspondence is being deposited with the United States Postal Service with sufficient postage as first class mail, in an envelope addressed to: Mail Stop Petition, Commissioner of Patents, P.O. Box 1450, Alexandria, VA 22313-1450, on this 6th day of December, 2007.

Christine Hartness

---

Name



---

Signature